



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,498	01/12/2001	Phillip W. Barnett	6874-105 / 10024998	2476

41939 7590 06/13/2006

JEANNE E. LONGMUIR
2836 CORYDON ROAD
CLEVELAND HEIGHTS, OH 44118

EXAMINER

EHICHIOYA, FRED I

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/759,498	BARNETT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fred I. Ehichioya	2162	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Fred I. Ehichioya.

(3) _____

 (2) Jeanne E. Longmuir (Reg. No. 33,133).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 5 June 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

139

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner suggests to applicant's representative (Ms. Longmuir) to clarify the claim limitation using for example the language of the specification to explain ("m" "actions" and "n" "objects") so that the examiner can make a recommendation to his supervisor for a possible allowance. Examiner regrets if this suggestion creates ambiguity for the applicant's representative as far as this suggestion is concerned. However, Examiner has discussed this issue with his supervisor (Mr. Breene). The application continues to remain in "appealed" status and any further action will be forth coming in writing within the next two weeks.